







AN
E S S A Y
ON THE
Authenticity
OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT;
WITH
AN ACCOUNT
OF THE
ANCIENT VERSIONS,
AND SOME OF THE
PRINCIPAL GREEK MANUSCRIPTS.

BY
J. F. GYLES, ESQ. A. M.

“ For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.”—ROM. i. 16

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD,
BOOKSELLER TO HER MAJESTY,
NO. 190, OPPOSITE ALBANY, PICCADILLY.
1812.

AN

Y A S S

ON THE

Authenticity

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT

WITH

AN ACCOUNT

OF THE

EXISTENT VERSIONS

AND SOME OF THE

PRINCIPAL GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

BY

J. E. GILES, ESQ. A.M.

For I am not ashamed of this Gospel of Christ. — Rom. 1: 12

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD,
BOOKSELLER TO HER MAJESTY,
NO 10, COLOSSEUM ALLEY, PICCADILLY

1812

PREFACE.

THE object of the following Essay is to compress in a few pages, in the compass of an hour's reading, some important arguments for the authenticity of the New Testament, with as much general information on the subject as the limits of the plan would admit. The Author lays no claim to the merit of originality. Should his Treatise prove in any degree useful, his purpose will be fully answered.

Montfaucon, Wetstein, Woide, Michaelis, Marsh, &c. furnish sources of information to which every person, who writes on the subjects connected with this Essay, must necessarily refer. From

the two first of these some material extracts are given in the Notes. The principal dates in the Chronological Table are taken from "Hale's Analysis of Chronology."

It is the intention of the Author that this Essay should be succeeded by an Inquiry into the *Credibility* of the New Testament, in which the testimony of the early Fathers will be more fully and critically examined.

AN
E S S A Y,

&c.

THE truth of Christianity, like the being of its great Author, is established by numerous arguments, differing in kind, and derived from various and independent sources; whilst in each case the variety of concurring evidence, and the united aid of a diversity of proofs, highly increase the intensity of the conviction. Yet clear and strong as is the evidence for these truths, experience informs us that they are not so fully or universally received as their advocates could wish. Whether the present scepticism arises from the age being more enlightened and inquisi-

tive, or more supine and indifferent; from its vigour, or from its imbecility; or whether the extremes of scepticism and credulity are not alike symptoms of mental weakness, are questions which, though interesting, are foreign to my present inquiry. But however opinions may vary, or whatever complexion they may assume, it will be of the highest consequence to those who wish to found their system on the basis of true philosophy, to consider well the following observation of a luminous and profound writer: "For securing the mind from superstition and false philosophy, and enabling it to maintain a steady course of inquiry between implicit credulity and unlimited scepticism, the most important of all qualities, is a sincere and devoted attachment to truth, which seldom fails to be accompanied with a manly confidence in the clear conclusions of human reason*." This sincere and devoted attach-

* Dugald Stewart, *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, p. 35.

ment to truth is the surest indication of a virtuous disposition, and of sound moral principles; and there is the highest authority for the assertion, that on certain subjects the dispositions of the heart exert a powerful influence over the speculations of the mind.

That the Deity not only exists, but that he is the constantly operating efficient cause in nature, and the great connecting principle among all the various phænomena which we observe, is a conclusion which may be deduced by the soundest process of metaphysical reasoning, from premises acknowledged and established by the most acute philosophers*. Nor will it then be denied that He, the eternal Mind, whose awful power and constant, but mysterious agency †, upholds the

* See Stewart's *Philosophy of the Human Mind*, p. 72, 78, &c. and p. 548.

† For the process of reasoning adopted by those who are advocates for that system which would keep constantly in view the perpetual dependence of the universe, in its *matter as well as in its form*, on the hand of the Creator, see Stewart's *Philosophical Essays*, p. 86.

fabric of the universe, and supports every being that exists, has the best founded right to claim the unlimited service and unconditional obedience of every creature he sustains. May we not fairly insist upon the probability that he would declare to moral agents what sort of obedience he requires, and to rational creatures, for what end he has created them? To this point of probability, and perhaps of hope, the unassisted efforts of the human mind might carry us; and an expectation that some revelation would be granted to man, receives encouragement from the conclusions of the metaphysician. But should the candid inquirer, in endeavouring to establish the preliminary truths at the outset of this argument, find himself perplexed by subtleties and objections, or should he shrink from the task of following his adversary through the endless mazes and subterfuges of sophistry and scepticism, he may avail himself of other resources; let him direct his views to the

order of nature ; let him observe the simple and beautiful laws by which physical events are regulated ; let him consider the marks of design displayed in the formation of the human frame, in the powers and properties of matter, and the peculiar and marked adaptation of the one to the other ; let him investigate the nice adjustments, and regular, though apparently anomalous, movements of the heavenly bodies ; or let him from the magnificent spectacle presented by the universe, turn inwards upon himself, and reflect on the still more astonishing phænomena exhibited by the powers and faculties of his own mind : wherever he directs his views he will not fail to trace with unerring certainty the hand of the Divine Artist, and to see the stamp of Divinity indelibly impressed on every part of nature. Thus by an attentive examination of the constitution of nature he will be prepared and disposed to receive the truths of Revelation, and he will discover similitudes and analogies between each, that

will point out the same being as their author. Between each he will see this one strong point of resemblance, that though he is well acquainted with the relation subsisting between things, though he can reason with certainty upon such relationship, and arrive at truth in his conclusions, he is still ignorant of the nature of the things themselves. He will not raise any objection to the truth of Revelation, because it contains doctrines which he cannot in this infant state of his being fully comprehend, aware that many propositions in natural philosophy, in chemistry, in every branch of science, are indisputable, though equally mysterious.

Clearly as the Divine hand is traced in the works of nature, no less conspicuously is it perceived in the religion of Christ—in the number and character of its evidences. Indeed it has ever appeared to me a subject peculiarly demanding our gratitude, that the Supreme Being has given such variety of proofs of the truth of Christianity, in order that every

cast of mind may find that evidence upon which it can rest with the greatest security. It may appeal to the proof from miracles, so public and stupendous as to preclude all possibility of deception; to the proof from prophecy, a continually increasing evidence, the object of which is so clearly defined and the completion so notorious, that it is impossible to resolve the application of it into the ingenuity of accommodation or the industry of research. It may draw its conclusions from the character of Christ, the most wonderful part of the whole dispensation—from the nature of the dispensation itself and its doctrines—from the character of the Apostles—from the diversity of characters delineated, so unlike, as has been well remarked, to the partial or fictitious accounts of holy persons, where we find them all cast in the same mould. Each of these subjects has been urged and insisted upon by Christian advocates; and whilst each singly is capable of affording convic-

tion, the whole body of proof almost extorts it.

In order to mark out with precision the line of argument observed in this Essay, and to show the object, nature, and bearings of the present inquiry into the authenticity of the New Testament, as well as its influence upon the truth of the Christian religion, I will suppose certain questions proposed to me. For the sake of perspicuity, and in order to curtail various objections, I will substitute the truth of the resurrection for the truth of the Christian religion. This will simplify the argument, and convey definite and clear ideas. No one who admits that fact to have taken place, can deny the truth of the Christian religion. I will also, in the answer to the following questions, make some remarks on the general nature of the evidence afforded, and on the importance of the inquiry.

How can it be proved that Jesus Christ rose from the dead—that the Gospel history,

which professes to give an account of certain transactions, was written by persons who were eye-witnesses of them, or who lived at the time they took place, and had proper means of information? Admitting some extraordinary person to have existed, and to have founded the Christian religion which now prevails, still, how can we know with any certainty the transactions which took place nineteen centuries ago? Were such or similar questions proposed (and I think they are the questions that would be likely to occur to the majority of unbelievers), I should reply, that with regard to the first point, as a previous step to any investigation, it would be necessary to settle what kind of proof we ought to expect, and of what sort of proof the nature of the thing is capable. I should observe, that abstract reasoning is here totally inapplicable; that a fact could not be proved to have taken place from metaphysical reasoning; but that the proof must arise wholly from evidence—that it

depends on testimony *. That it should also be remembered that the grand cause of Christianity is supported by an appeal to facts. That the most enlightened of the Apostolic number rested the whole truth of the doctrine upon one single fact—Jesus Christ rose from the dead. That this was adapted to the capacity of every one; it was what the most simple might understand, and where delusion, or its most dangerous species, self-delusion, could have no place. That whenever the Deity has vouchsafed a revelation to man, it has been attended by such sensible evidences as could leave no doubt of its reality and Divine origin; and that it is an awful but inconceivably important consideration, that He who well knows the impression such evidences will make upon the mind, will also know whether we are

* “It would be as absurd to think to demonstrate a fact by syllogism, as to endeavour to establish a mathematical theorem by an affidavit.”—Horsley, Letters to Dr. Priestley.

excusable in rejecting them. That it would surely not be dealing fairly with ourselves to allow trivial objections to have weight with us in the concerns of religion, supported as it is by a vast accumulation of evidence from independent sources, and enforced by such awful sanctions; objections, which would not in any of the common transactions of life have the smallest influence on our conduct.

Having premised thus much concerning the nature of the proof we ought to expect, and the infinite importance of the inquiry, I should begin by a general statement, that the fact of Christ's resurrection was thus peculiarly attested—by *antecedent testimony* (if the expression may be allowed), since it was foretold in ancient prophecy; by *direct testimony*, the force of which depends upon the genuineness and credit of our records; and by a state of things actually existing, which can be accounted for on no other supposition whatever but that such a fact took place. Reserving the proof from prophecy

for the subject of a future Essay, my sole aim in the following pages shall be to state our reasons for believing the genuineness of the four Gospels; the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, the First Epistle of St. Peter, and First Epistle of St. John*; and I will view them as records asserting, and every where assuming the truth of that important and glorious fact—Jesus Christ rose from the dead. I have hinted before, as a separate ground of argument, that if the Gospel history had been lost or had never been written, it would still be indisputably certain that the primitive teachers of Christianity preached the resurrection of Jesus; and the strongest grounds for believing *now* the fact which they *then* preached, would arise from the *events* which are described by heathen testimonies; and from the ceremonies appointed and constantly observed as com-

* These writings have been universally received and acknowledged as genuine. See Note [A].

memorative of our Saviour's resurrection. But the proof of this fact would in that case be rendered more complex ; whereas now, if we can establish the credit of our records, the fact is substantiated. The first step towards accomplishing this, will be to prove the antiquity of these writings ; that they are co-eval with the events which they relate ; that they have been universally received as genuine, and acknowledged and known as such by those to whom they were addressed. That the style of the writing corroborates the universal suffrage of the Christian church, and fixes the writers. That the original writings have not been altered, but that they are to every purpose the same which the early Christians received. This inquiry is confined to the authenticity of the New Testament ; it does not extend to its credibility. The order I adopt in this investigation, is, first to give an account of the ancient versions, and some of the principal manuscripts of the Greek Testa-

ment. I then proceed to the testimony of Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian. I shall slightly touch upon the confirmation afforded by the fathers, and the internal evidence derived from the nature of the style; and under each I shall draw certain conclusions.

*Of the ANCIENT VERSIONS of the New
Testament.*

One most important advantage derived from the ancient versions, is, that by their means we arrive at the certain knowledge (in the words of Michaelis), that the Sacred Writings have been transmitted from the earliest to the present age, without material variation; and that our present Text, except a very few doubtful passages, is the same which proceeded from the hands of the Apostles.

Of the OLD SYRIAC VERSION.

THIS most ancient and venerable version was called by the Syrians *Peshito*, or the Faithful Version, and is of inestimable use in sacred criticism. It long served as a model for interpreters in the East, as the Vulgate did to those in the West: it is *universally* allowed to have existed at least as early as the close of the second century; and there are the strongest grounds for believing that it existed at the very beginning of that century, if not at the end of the first. This opinion of its early date has many powerful advocates. According to Abulfaragi*, it was written in the

* Dr. Hales, in his most valuable and elaborate work on Chronology, vol. ii. preface, p. xx. thus speaks of this celebrated historian, whose real name was Gregorius Bar Hebræus: "Though bred a physician, and a leader of the Jacobite sect of Christians in Syria, he was admired by Mahometan and Jewish writers, as the phoenix of his age." And "we justly venerate him," says Michaelis, "as the most learned and best historian of the Syrian

apostolic age, in the days of the Apostle Adæus, Thaddæus, or Jude; according to Michaelis, near the end of the first century. It is quoted by Ephrem Syrus, who died about the year 379, and was deacon of the church of Edessa, the city, probably, where this version was written. Christianity was planted in Edessa, in the first century, and adopted by his sovereigns; its language was Syriac, and it was for many ages the eastern metropolis of the Christian world. This version contains the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, the First Epistle of St. John, the First Epistle of St. Peter, and the Epistle of St. James. The Revelations are not found in it. From this omission an argument has been drawn in favour of the antiquity of this version, as having

writers.”—“To this honourable distinction,” adds Dr. Hales, “I also willingly subscribe, having found him the best and surest guide in adjusting the chronology of the Patriarchs, &c. supplying important chasms, both in the Scriptures and Josephus, with an accuracy and fidelity not to be found elsewhere.”

been translated before the Revelations were written or received as canonical. The Revelations are referred to the year 95. This version is written in a language not materially different from that spoken by our Lord and his Apostles: the difference is not greater than that which is observed between the Attic and the Ionic dialects in Greek. (Campbell on the Gospels, vol. i. p. 443.) Michaelis observes, that the affinity of the Syriac to the dialect of Palestine is so great as to justify, in some respects, the assertion that the Syriac translator has recorded the actions and speeches of Christ in the very language in which he spoke; and that the difference between the dialect which was spoken by Christ, and that of the Syriac translator, consisted almost wholly in the mode of pronunciation. The same writer also remarks, that as the Aramæan words which occur in Christ's discourses are expressed in our Greek Gospels according to the punctuation of the Chaldee dialect which was spoken at Jerusalem, and

was more refined than the Syriac, we must conclude, that though Syriac was spoken in Galilee, the former was used by Christ. The more modern Syriac versions belong to the fifth and seventh centuries*.

Of the COPTIC VERSION.

There is reason to believe that this version was made as early as the beginning of the fourth century. It was used by the Egyptian Christians, called Copts. The Coptic language is a mixture of the old Egyptian and the Greek, and was the common language of Egypt before the invasion of the Saracens. From this the Arabic versions are derived †.

* See Note [B].

† See Note [C].

Of the SAHIDIC VERSION.

The great antiquity of this version is unquestionable; it is referred to the second century. The Sahidic was the dialect of Upper Egypt, called in Arabic Said. The arguments made use of by Dr. Woide, to prove its great antiquity, are stated by the learned Dr. Marsh, in his excellent Notes to Michaelis (vol. iii. p. 595), an outline of which is as follows: there are now in existence two Sahidic manuscripts, one formerly in the possession of Dr. Askew, the other brought from Egypt by the celebrated Bruce. The former contains a work, entitled, Sophia, and written by Valentinus, in the second century. This manuscript contains various passages both from the Old and New Testament, which coincide with the fragments of the Sahidic version now extant; whence it is concluded, that a Sahidic version of the whole Bible not only existed so early as the *beginning* of the second century, but that it was the same as that of which we

have various fragments, and which, if put together, would form perhaps a complete Sahidic version of the Bible. The other manuscript, to which Dr. Woide appeals, contains two books, the one entitled, Βιβλος της γνωσεως, the other Βιβλος λογε κατα μυσηριον.

Now that this was written by a Gnostic, as well as the other manuscript, appears both from the title and the contents, and therefore it is concluded that the author lived in the second century. And as various passages are quoted in it both from the Old and New Testament, Dr. Woide deduces the same inference as from the foregoing.

Of the ETHIOPIC VERSION.

The Ethiopic was the language of the Abyssinians; the version into this language was probably made about the fourth century, and is said to agree with the Alexandrian manuscript. Christianity was in very early times

preached in Ethiopia, but unfortunately the ecclesiastical history of these ages is involved in doubt and uncertainty. Ludolf * supposes that the Abyssinians were converted to Christianity by Frumentius, a bishop in the fourth century, who has likewise the credit of having made the Ethiopic version †.

Of other ANCIENT VERSIONS.

I shall barely mention the Armenian ‡, Arabic, and Persic § versions; indeed, the reason that I mention them is, that the existence of these versions proves the great care which was bestowed upon the Scriptures in very ancient times, and the number of different countries in which they were read and valued. This circumstance also, though there are many others, forms a very broad and clear

* Lud. Hist. Æthiop. lib. iii. cap. 2. See also cap. 4.

† See Note [D].

‡ See Note [E].

§ See Note [F].

line of distinction between our sacred Scriptures and any other writings which pretend to give an account of the same transactions, whether spurious or apocryphal. It completely satisfies the mind as to the question what was the doctrine the Apostles professed to teach; what was the story, for the truth of which the primitive Christians suffered and died. The Armenian version was made by Miesrob, in the fourth century. The Arabic versions are of later date, and supposed to be posterior to the time of Mahomet. The old Persic version is lost; the Persic versions now in existence are modern, and are thought to be taken from the Syriac.

Of the LATIN VERSION.

The Latin is the most ancient of all the European versions: it was of the same importance to the Christians of the West, as the Syriac was to those of the East. Before the

end of the first century, or the death of St. John, the Gospel was widely disseminated; and about that time the canon of the Scriptures of the New Testament, so far as immediately relates to faith and practice, was well established*. About the same time it is probable that there were translations made of the Scriptures of the New Testament into the Latin language; that which was universally received, and of the highest authority, was called *the Italic*. In the time of St. Jerome, or about the year 380, transcribers and translators were multiplied, and great confusion prevailed in the copies of the old Latin version. St. Augustine says, that the number of those who had translated the Scriptures from the Greek into the Latin could not be computed. “ Qui Scripturas ex Hebræâ linguâ in Græcam verterunt numerari possunt, Latini autem interpretes nullo

* This is the opinion of Sir David Dalrymple (Lord Hailes) in that excellent work, “ An Inquiry into the secondary Causes assigned by Gibbon, &c.”

modo." St. Jerome published a corrected edition from a revision of the old versions, and a comparison of them with the Greek ; and this corrected edition was the origin of the present Vulgate, which is a mixture of the old Italic version belonging to the first century, and that of Jerome belonging to the fourth.

HAVING arrived at this point of the inquiry, let me now request the reader to cast his eye on a map, and to observe over what extent and variety of countries, where different manners, habits, and languages prevailed, the Scriptures had spread at this early period ; and in the examination of the events belonging to the several portions of this period, let him observe that no forgeries could have been imposed upon the Christians during the first century, or the beginning of the second, as many disciples of St. John and of the other Apostles must then have been living : yet the

existence of the Syriac and Latin versions at this age incontestably proves that our Scriptures were the accounts then received and sanctioned by the Christian churches. Let the reader turn to the Chronological Table, and he will see that soon after this time Christian writers became so numerous, that it would have been impossible for any later forgery to have found reception. It must have been immediately detected. Thus we are conducted by sure guides to a period, after which all attempts at forgery must have been totally useless. Let it also be considered what was the state of the Christian communities during these early times. The pride of the philosopher, the craft of priests, and the power of the magistrate, were all in combination against them. A conviction of the truth and integrity of their cause could alone render their situation supportable. It was not a time for the luxuriance of imagination to display itself in romance. The church had now twice "passed through the flames of persecution, and

"had grown mighty by trials and sufferings."

If these circumstances are candidly taken into consideration, it must be acknowledged, that it is impossible to fix upon any period or any place that could have given birth to a forgery, or where any false account of the main transactions could have obtained reception.

Of the MANUSCRIPTS of the GREEK TESTAMENT.

THROUGH the providence of God, many very ancient and valuable manuscripts have been transmitted to us. The following sentence from Dr. Paley's *Evidences of Christianity* will be a good introduction to the short account I shall give of some of the principal manuscripts. "The existence of these manuscripts proves that the Scriptures were not the production of any modern contrivance: it does away also the uncertainty which hangs over such publications, as the works, real or pretended, of Ossian and Rowley, in which the editors are challenged to produce their manuscripts, and to show where they obtained their copies. The number of manuscripts far exceeding those of any other book, and their wide dispersion, afford an argument in some measure to the senses, that the Scriptures anciently, in like man-

“ner as at this day, were more read and sought
 “after than any other books, and that also in
 “many different countries.” The MSS.
 which I shall describe, and which I consider
 of the greatest authority, are the Codex Alex-
 andrinus, the Codex Cantabrigiensis (or Co-
 dex Bezae), the Codex Ephrem, the Codex
 Claromontanus, and the Codex Vaticanus.

It would be difficult to determine the precise
 period to which the autographa, or original
 manuscripts of the Apostles and Evangelists,
 were preserved: they have certainly been long
 ago lost; but there are many MSS. which
 have been transcribed from them, or from
 other MSS. which were copies of them. The
 value and importance of a MS., or the proba-
 bility that it is correct*, greatly depends on
 its antiquity; on the antiquity either of the
 MS. itself, or of the one from which it was
 taken. For, as Walton observes, “Quo plures
 codices descripti et quo longius a prototypis

* See Note [G].

distant, eo plures mendas contrahere proclive est." Proleg. vii. The ages of different MSS. may be ascertained either by testimony or internal marks. The most satisfactory and certain persuasion of the antiquity of a MS. will be derived from an examination of the various internal marks belonging to it, such as the form of the letters, and a comparison of them with inscriptions, the date of which is known, the want of accents, marks of aspiration and intervals, &c.; and by these means, though the exact age of a MS. cannot always be ascertained, yet certain limits to its age may be defined with precision. We know that the Greek characters during the first six centuries underwent little variation. In the eighth century the Greek uncial characters degenerated from the square and round form, which is seen in the ancient MSS., to an oblong shape. Jerome in the fourth century added the comma and colon to the Latin version, and they were then inserted in the more ancient

MSS. Euthalius, a deacon of Alexandria, divided the New Testament into lines in the fifth century. Accents were not introduced generally into MSS. of the Greek Testament before the seventh century*, and the Greek note of interrogation was first made use of in the ninth.

These MSS. are written either on parchment, or vellum, or paper. Eight leaves joined together formed a quaternio, six leaves a ternio; and in this way the MSS. were divided; the leaves also were marked by lines, upon which they wrote: the letters are either uncial (*i. e.* capital) or small. I have mentioned the variation in the form of the uncial letters which took place at different times. The small letters belong to MSS. of a late age. In the old MSS. the mode of spelling some words is different from the present, and abbreviations are used. The three or four first lines at the beginning of a new book are

* See Note [H].

written in vermillion; the division into two kinds of chapters generally prevails; the longer sort of chapters being called in Greek *κεφαλαι*, and in Latin *breves*; and the table of the contents of each *brevis*, which was prefixed to the copies of the New Testament, *breviarium*; the shorter *κεφαλαια*, *capitula*, and the list of them was called *capitulatio*. This method of dividing is very ancient*. In the oldest MSS. the words are written without any separation.—See Wetstein's account of MSS. Note [I].

* Formerly there were many of these divisions, though none of them were received by the Church in general. Eusebius regulated his Canon of the four Gospels by that division, which was then most generally approved. Ammonius, who lived at Alexandria in the third century, is said to have been the author of this division, with respect to the *capitula*—Tatian, with respect to the *brevis*. Euthalius in the fifth century divided the Acts and Epistles into those chapters which are commonly found in the Greek MS.

Of the CODEX ALEXANDRINUS.

It is observed by a learned and candid critic (Mill), that the Church has been in possession of nothing more valuable during the last twelve hundred years than this MS.; and that it is the oldest, and has the most accurate text of any in the world. “Et jam quidem aperiundus est ingens ille thesaurus Orientis, quo per annos ducentos ultra mille nihil usquam pretiosius vidit orbis Christianus.” § 1338. “Textum vero ipsum quod spectat, ut est exemplaris Nov. Test. omnium toto orbe longè vetustissima, ita certè jam ab ipsis fere canonis incunabulis vix exstitisse censeo, qui archetypam Evangelistarum & Apostolorum scripturam ipso fidelius expresserit.” § 1341.—Whether it fully merits this encomium of being the most valuable and oldest of the three principal MSS. may well be disputed; but its great antiquity is unquestionable.

This venerable MS. was presented by Cyril-
 lus Lucasius*, Patriarch of Constantinople, to
 Charles I. by the hands of his ambassador at
 the Porte, Sir Thomas Roe, and was de-
 posited, in 1753, in the British Museum.
 That it was written in Egypt (in which
 country Cyrillus procured it), is established
 by peculiar marks in the MS. itself, and by
 its orthography. Tradition assigns the work
 to Thecla, an Egyptian lady of high rank,
 who lived soon after the Council of Nice.
 On this point accurate information must not
 be expected.

The MS. consists of four folios, three of
 which contain the Old Testament, and the
 fourth the New Testament, together with
 the First Epistle of Clement to the Corin-
 thians, and a fragment of the Second. It is
 written with uncial (or capital) letters, with-

* This man's partiality for the Church of England drew
 on him the hatred of the Catholics, which ended with
 his death.

out marks of aspiration, accents, or intervals between the words, which demonstrates its high antiquity. A *difference* is observed in the ink and in the form of the letters, and it appears to be the work of two *different* transcribers. Woide, who had examined it with the most minute attention, and printed it line for line with types cast for that purpose, and perfectly similar to the original MS. declares it to have been written between the middle and end of the fourth century. From Woide's preface to the fac-simile of this MS. I have given extracts in the Notes *. I will only add, that it is impossible that this MS. should be of later date than the eighth century, and that it coincides remarkably with the Coptic and Syriac Versions.

* See Note [K].

Of the CODEX CANTABRIGIENSIS, *or* CODEX
BEZÆ.

This is a Greek and Latin MS. of the four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. The Gospels are arranged in the usual order of the Latin MSS. Matthew, John, Luke, Mark.

“Constat iste Codex 413 foliis in quarto majori, singulis paginis lineas 33 continentibus, complectiturque Evangelia et Acta Apostolorum Græcè & Latinè.”—Wetstein’s Proleg. p. 30. Mill calls this, “Codex membranaceus in quarto grandiori.” It is written with uncial letters, without accents, or marks of aspiration, or intervals between the words, which determines its high antiquity; perhaps of all the MSS. now extant, this is the most ancient, at least none can be put in competition with it except the Codex Vaticanus. It was probably written in the West of Europe,

and coincides with the Syriac, Coptic, and Sahidic Versions. Dr. Marsh, in his learned Notes to Michaelis, vol. iii. p. 711, ingeniously conjectures that this MS. was written either at Constantinople, or in some city of the Greek empire in Europe for the use of some person or community belonging to the Latin Church, between the time of Constantine and the final separation of the Greek and Latin Churches. The hand-writing is that of a Greek scribe; a Latin translation is added to the Greek text, and the Latin order is observed in the arrangement of the four Gospels. In order to solve some peculiar *phænomena* exhibited, the same acute critic likewise supposes that the writer of the Codex Bezaë used several Greek MSS. from which he selected those readings which appeared to him to be the best, and that one of those MSS. was of the Alexandrine edition. This MS. was presented to the University of Cambridge by Beza, in the year 1581, who found it at Lyons, in the

monastery of St. Irenæus, where it had lain for a long series of years. Beza wrote, in the beginning of this MS. the following account with his own hand: "*Est hoc exemplar venerandæ vetustatis ex Græciâ, ut apparet ex barbaris quibusdam Græcis ad marginem notatis, olim exportatum, et in S. Irenæi monasterio Lugdunensi, ita, ut hic cernitur, mutilatum, postquam ibi in pulvere diu jacuisset, repertum, oriente ibi civili bello, anno Domini 1562.*" The Ammonian sections in this MS. are noted in the margin by a different and later hand than that which wrote the MS. itself. If from this circumstance we conclude that it was written before the invention of the Ammonian sections, we shall refer it to the end of the second century, or beginning of the third. And if we are not compelled to allow that the previous existence of the Euthalian sections is implied from the sections the writer of this MS. has adopted in the Acts of the Apostles (which perhaps is not a necessary

inference), it may undoubtedly be referred to the *second century*. Dr. Kipling published this MS. at Cambridge, with types cast for that purpose, line for line, without intervals between the words, as in the original MS.; and he assigns its age to the *second century*. From a comparison of the Codex Cantab. with Greek inscriptions of different ages, it will follow that it could not have been written later than the sixth century; and that it may have been written three centuries earlier.

Of the CODEX CLAROMONTANUS.

This is a Greek and Latin MS. of the Epistles of St. Paul. It once belonged to Beza, who gave it the title of Claromontanus, from Clermont, in the diocese of Beauvais, where it is said to have been preserved. It soon after came into the Royal Library at

Paris. It is written with uncial letters, but it has accents and marks of interrogation; though these were afterwards added. It was probably written in the West of Europe, and coincides more with the Syriac version than with any other. This coincidence is a proof of its antiquity. According to Montfaucon, it was written in the seventh century. Blanchini* refers it to the same age. In the Notes† I have given Montfaucon's description of this MS. From the form of the characters, we may be assured that it was not written later than the seventh century. It has been supposed by some to have been a continuation of the Codex Cantabrigiensis. This cannot be the case. The vellum on which they are written is different, the pages of the Codex Cantabrigiensis are much longer than those of the Codex Claromon-

* Blanchini, in the *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, opp. p. 533, gives a fac-simile of its characters, and says, "Scriptus videtur circa vii. sæc."

† See Note [L].

tanus, and the form of each is so dissimilar that no person who should compare the two MSS. could suppose that one was a continuation of the other. “Membrana in Cant. est crassior, in hoc tenuissima—forma Cant. codicis multò est major, quàm Claromontani, et lineæ latiores, et paginae longiores, ita ut nemo homo si duo ista volumina juxta se posita cerneret, unum alterius partem esse diceret.”—Wetstein, Prolegom. p. 5.

Of the CODEX EPHREM.

What remains, and is legible, of the New Testament in this MS. is written with uncial letters, and without accents*. The first part of this MS. contains several Greek works of Ephrem, the Syrian, under which

* It has the *τίτλοι* and *κεφαλαια* of Eusebius a primæ manu.

appears, almost erased, but still legible, a part of the text of the Greek Bible:—"Continet S. Ephrem Syri varia opuscula Græca, sub quibus in eâdem membranâ atramento flavescente aut potius spongia deleta latent insignia fragmenta Vet. & Nov. Test."—Wetstein, Proleg. p. 27. Michaelis justly remarks that we may presume that those MSS. are very ancient, in which an old text has been erased to make room for a new.

Wetstein concludes, from a marginal note to Heb. vii. 7 (with great probability), that this MS. was written before the institution of the feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, that is, before the year 542. Wetstein had collated this MS. again and again, with the greatest accuracy, as he says, after mentioning others who had collated it, "A me vero semel atque iterum multò accuratius collata." To his judgment I should certainly submit, that the Codex Ephrem was written *before* the year 542. I refer the

reader to the Notes* for Montfaucon's description of this MS.

Of the **CODEx VATICANUS.**

Though there are many MSS. of the New Testament in the Vatican, yet that which is noted in the Vatican Library, 1209, is called in general Codex Vaticanus, without any further mark of distinction †. This most ancient and valuable MS. is written with uncial letters, and without intervals; neither is any difference observed in the size of the letters, which in other MSS. are generally larger at the beginning of a section; but in this they are all of the same size, except at the beginning of a book. This is a

* See Note [M].

† Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 342.

proof of very high antiquity*. It has, however, accents and marks of aspiration of a peculiar form, which were *sometimes* used in the MSS. of the Greek Testament, even in the fifth century. The characters are said to resemble those of the Greek MSS. which have been discovered in the ruins of Herculaneum. This MS. like its rival, the Codex Alexandrinus, contained originally the whole Greek Bible, including both the Old and the New Testament. It contests the point of seniority with its rival; but no two MSS. are so similar to each other in antiquity, characters, and contents. We must observe, however, with regard to the readings of the Codex Alex. and Codex Vat. that they differ considerably, both in the Old and New Testament. This MS. carries internal marks of very great antiquity. The division of the Greek Testament into the κεφαλαια and τιτλοι of Eusebius, is not

* Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iii. p. 813.

adopted, which Dr. Marsh observes is a presumptive proof that it was written before the canons of Eusebius were in general use in the country where the transcriber lived; and we may certainly pronounce that the Codex Vaticanus was written before the close of the fifth century.

In the Gospels the Codex Vaticanus has a great resemblance to the Codex Ephrem, Codex Cantabrigiensis, Codex R. Stephani octavus, and to the Latin, Coptic, and Ethiopic Versions. It is written with great accuracy, and is evidently a faithful copy of the more ancient MS. from which it was transcribed. It has received some corrections from a modern hand, but these alterations leave the ancient reading *distinctly visible*. We may conclude that the celebrated Codex Vaticanus is a MS. of the highest antiquity and greatest authority.

HAVING now given a short account of five principal MSS. of the New Testament, this will not be an improper place to make a few remarks on the subject of various readings, of omissions, and additions in different MSS. * “All the *omissions* of the ancient MSS. put together could not countenance the omission of one essential doctrine of the Gospel, relative either to faith or morals. And all the *additions* countenanced by the whole mass of MSS. already collated, do not introduce a single point essential either to faith or manners beyond what may be found even in the Complutensian or Elzevir editions. And though for the beauty, emphasis, and critical perfection of the letter of the

* These observations are taken from Dr. Adam Clarke, author of the *Bibliographical Dictionary*, &c.

New Testament, a new edition, formed on such a plan as that of Griesbach, is greatly to be desired; yet from such an one infidelity can expect no help, false doctrine no support, and even true religion no accession to its excellence, as indeed it needs none. The multitude of various readings found in MSS. should no more weaken any man's faith in the Divine Word than the multitude of typographical errors found in printed editions of the Scriptures; nor indeed can it be otherwise, unless God were to interpose, and miraculously prevent every scribe from making a false letter, and every compositor from mistaking a word in the text he was copying. It is enough that God absolutely preserves the whole truth in such a way as is consistent with his moral government of the world. The preservation of the jots and tittles in every transcriber's copy, and in every printer's form, by a miraculous act of Almighty power, is not to be expected, and is not necessary to the

accomplishment of the Divine purpose. Yet even those may be all preserved by the general superintendency of the Divine Providence in some MS. or MSS. now extant." On this subject the intelligent reader will be pleased with the opinion of that very eminent critic, Dr. Bentley. "Not frightened," says he, "with the present thirty thousand various readings (those collected by Dr. Mill), I, for my own part, and, as I believe, many others, would not lament if out of the old MSS. yet untouched, ten thousand more were faithfully collected: some of which, without question, would render the text more beautiful, just, and exact; though of no consequence to the main of religion; nay, perhaps wholly synonymous in the view of common readers, and quite insensible in any modern version."—*Philaleuth. Lipsiens.* p. 90.

Of the TESTIMONY of CELSUS.

CELSUS was an Epicurean philosopher, who wrote against the Christians, between the year 170 and the year 180, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus. His book was entitled, "The True Word," and it was answered by Origen before the year 250 *. In this answer the objections of Celsus are preserved, and preserved in his own language. It is not a general reply to Celsus, but a minute examination of all his objections, even of those which appeared to Origen most frivolous; his friend Ambrosius, to whom he dedicates the work, having desired him to omit nothing. In the course of this examination Origen states the objections of Celsus in his own words; and, that nothing might escape him, he takes them in the order in which Celsus had placed them. Celsus ac-

* Lardner, vol. viii. p. 6, and p. 69.

knowledges, that it is but a few years since Jesus Christ delivered his doctrine *. This proves that Celsus lived in very early times; that Jesus Christ was not a fictitious, but a real person, who lived about the time commonly assigned, and that his actions were then almost fresh in remembrance. I will mention some passages directly asserting the existence of an ancient original account of undoubted authority with the early Christians, and also a few striking particulars that Celsus quotes from the Gospels; an enumeration of them all would be an abridgment of the Evangelists' history. The first passage which I shall adduce is of extreme importance: "Afterwards," he says †, "that some of the

* Origen cont. Celsum, edit. Spenser sen. Cantab. 1658, p. 21. All the references are to this edition.

† This translation and that of the other passages is Lardner's. The original is, Μετα ταυτα τινας των πιστευοντων φησιν ως εκ μιθης ηκοντας εις το εφεσθαι αυτοις, μεταχαρτιειν εκ της πρωτης γραφης το ευαγγελιον τριχη και τετραχη και πολλαχη και μεταπλατειν, ιν' εχουεν προς της ελιγχης αρεισθαι. Orig. cont. Cels. p. 77.

believers, as if they were drunk, take the liberty to alter *the Gospels* from the first writing, three or four ways, or oftener; that when they are pressed hard, and one reading has been confuted, they may disown that, and flee to another." Michaelis (p. 41, vol. i.) supposes it possible that the alterations with which Celsus charges the Christians were nothing else than various readings: and from this hypothesis, rendered more than probable by the objections of Porphyry hereafter noticed, it follows, that the New Testament had existed a considerable time (at the year 170), and been very frequently transcribed, since otherwise three or four different readings would hardly have been found of the same text. This accusation proves that there was then an *ancient original account*; and the next passage I shall adduce will show that this was written by the Apostles, the companions of Jesus Christ himself. I should observe that Origen's answer to the above charge (and he can never be accused of want of honesty, or

having any recourse to subterfuges) was, that he knew of no alterations except such as were made by disciples of Marcion, Valentinus, and perhaps Lucanus. After that*, says Origen, the Jew in Celsus goes on in this manner: "I could say many things concerning the affairs of Jesus, and those true too, different from those written by the disciples of Jesus; but I purposely omit them." It is not to be credited that Celsus would have made this omission if he could have contradicted the disciples upon good evidence in any material point. Origen well observes, it is a mere oratorical flourish †. Dr. Lardner's ‡ remark upon this passage is very material, that Celsus, by "Disciples of Jesus," does not mean his followers in general: for them he

* Μετα ταυτα φησιν ο παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαῖος· οἱ πολλοὶ ἔχον
 λιγὴν καὶ ἀληθὴ περὶ τῶν κατὰ Ἰησοῦν γινομένων, καὶ ἔ παραπληροῖα
 τοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν τῇ Ἰησοῦ γραφείοις, ἔκων ἐκεῖνα παραλείπων.
 P. 67.

† Ἡ δοκῶσα διανοητικὴ ῥητορικὴ χρῆσά μιν εἶναι
 λιγὴν. Ibid.

‡ Vol. viii. p. 9.

calls Christians, or believers, or the like; but he uses this term in the most strict and proper sense for those who had been taught by Jesus himself, that is, his Apostles and their companions. The next passage that I shall quote, when compared with the two I have already mentioned, incontestably proves that in the time of Celsus there were books well known and considered of the highest value, importance, and authority, allowed to be written by the companions of Jesus Christ himself, which books contained a history of him and his teaching, doctrine, and works.

“These things*,” says the Jew in Celsus, “we have alleged to you, out of *your own writings*, not needing any other witnesses. “Thus you are beaten with your own weapons.” But lest the smallest doubt should remain upon the mind of any one, whether by these expressions, “the Gospel,” “the

* Ταυτα μιν ουν υμιν εκ των υμετερων συγγραμματος, εφ' οις
 εδενος αλλε μαρτυρος χρηζομεν, αυτοι γαρ εαυτοις περιπιπτει.
 P. 106,

things written by the disciples of Jesus," "their own writings," Celsus could allude to any other works than our present four Gospels, I will enumerate a few particulars quoted by him, omitting his objections, cavils, and blasphemies, as well as the replies of his great antagonists. Celsus mentions Christ¹ and his incarnation; his being born of a ² virgin; his being worshipped by the ³ Magi; his ⁴ flight into Egypt; the slaughter⁵ of the infants. He speaks of Christ's baptism by John, of the descent of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove, and of the voice from heaven, declaring him to be the Son ⁶ of God; of his being accounted a prophet⁷ by his disciples; of his foretelling who should betray him⁸; his own

¹ Incarnation and birth of Christ, p. 22, 30, 32.

² Born of a Virgin, p. 30.

³ Worship of the Magi, p. 45.

⁴ Flight into Egypt, p. 30, 51.

⁵ Slaughter of the infants, p. 45,

⁶ Baptism of Christ and descent of the Holy Ghost, p. 31.

⁷ Christ accounted a Prophet, p. 69.

⁸ Foretells his own death and resurrection, p. 70, 71, 72,

death and resurrection: he allows that he was considered as a divine⁹ personage by his disciples; that they worshipped¹⁰ him as the¹¹ Son of God; he alludes frequently to the¹² Holy Spirit, and mentions God under the title of the Most High¹³, and speaks collectively of the¹⁴ Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; he does not deny the miracles of Christ and his Apostles, but attributes them to¹⁵ magic. He says that Christ was deserted¹⁶ by his disciples; that he was betrayed¹⁷ by one with whom he sat at table; that he prayed to his Father¹⁸ that the "cup might pass from him."

⁹ Christ's divinity, pp. 325, 327, 388.

¹⁰ His worship, p. 385, 387, 388.

¹¹ Christ the Son of God, p. 303, 385, 386, 387.

¹² Of the Holy Spirit, p. 323, 325, 363.

¹³ The most high God, p. 423.

¹⁴ Of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, p. 337.

¹⁵ Christ's miracles attributed to magic, p. 7, 30, 34, 55, 92, and 93.

¹⁶ Christ deserted by his disciples, p. 62.

¹⁷ Betrayed by one with whom he sat at table, p. 74.

¹⁸ Prays to his Father, that the cup might pass from him, p. 75.

He mentions the crucifixion¹⁹ of our Saviour, his death²⁰, resurrection²¹, the darkness²² and earthquake that took place at his death; and lastly, his appearing²³ to his disciples afterwards. This enumeration of particulars, which might still be greatly increased²⁴, must surely carry conviction that Celsus had our Gospels before him when he wrote his "True Word." All the attacks of Celsus are directed against the accounts found in the four Gospels, and in those only; he rarely alludes to any found in the spurious or apocryphal Gospels, though they were then numerous. The inference from this is obvious. If additional evidence

¹⁹ His crucifixion, p. 102.

²⁰ His death, p. 355.

²¹ His resurrection, p. 93, 94, 266, 352, 353.

²² The darkness and earthquake at the crucifixion, p. 94.

²³ His appearance afterwards, p. 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, and 355.

²⁴ I will add one more particular. Celsus observes, that when Jesus appeared in a public character, as a teacher of religion, he went about attended by ten or eleven disciples, whom he calls publicans and sailors (τιλανας και ισυλας), p. 47.

should still be required, to prove that he had each particular Gospel, we can, I think, supply it; that he had the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, is evident from his observation, that the “composers* of the genealogies of Jesus were very extravagant in making him to descend from the first man and the Jewish kings.” St. Luke, we know, carries up our Saviour’s genealogy to Adam; St. Matthew only to Abraham. That he had St. John’s Gospel, is proved from his mentioning a circumstance recorded only by St. John †, namely, “the blood which flowed from the body of Jesus when on the cross.” (John, xix. 34.) And if to this we add his remarks on the different accounts given by the Evangelists of the resurrection ‡, I consider the following conclusion inevitable: that Celsus attacked our present four Gospels, knowing that they were written by the Apostles of

* P. 80.

† P. 81.

‡ P. 266.

Jesus Christ himself, and their companions, and that they were believed from the first to contain an account of his life, works, and doctrine.

Of the TESTIMONY of PORPHYRY.

THIS subtle and inveterate adversary to the cause of Christianity was born in the year 233: he was of Tyrian origin, and called in his native language Malcho; he is also styled the Batanean, from Basan, the country either of his birth or residence; he was a man of great genius and extensive learning; his writings against the Christian religion were esteemed so dangerous, that they were burnt by an edict of Constantine the Great. Fortunately, however, sufficient fragments of his work * are preserved in the writings of Jerome and other Fathers, to show the nature of the charges he advanced against the Christian religion; and the consequence is, that the

* His work against the Christians was divided into fifteen books, as we find in Eusebius, and contained the blackest calumnies against the Christians. The first book treated of the contradictions he pretended to have found in the sacred writings.

strongest proof of the genuineness of our records is derived from this very attack. From the age in which Porphyry lived, which was not far removed from the period when the Gospels were first published, from his intimate acquaintance with the sacred writings, and from his various and profound erudition, he was of all men the most capable of detecting a forgery, or finding a flaw in them, if any had existed; he must have been well aware how severe a wound it would have given Christianity, could he have proved the Gospel history a forgery, or shown that the actors in the scenes therein described were fictitious persons; yet no trace of such an attempt, nor even of such a suspicion, is any where to be found; on the contrary, the nature of his objections to particular passages in our Scriptures clearly demonstrates, that he considered them as genuine, and that he knew the Gospels were written by those whose names they bear, and whom he afterwards re-

dicules for their ignorance. This will appear from his objections.

He objects to the quotation of a text (Matthew, ch. xiii. v. 35) from *Isaiah*, which is found in a Psalm (lxxviii. v. 2) ascribed to Asaph. The reading in the MS. used by Porphyry was, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet *Isaiah*, saying, &c." We now read, "By the Prophet, saying." It is supposed, and with great probability, that the word *Isaiah* was an interpolation or a substitution of some ignorant transcriber, or had crept from the margin into the text. This objection is met with in the Breviarium upon the Psalter, generally ascribed to Jerom: "It is not *Isaiah* that says this, but Asaph," observes that writer; "therefore the impious Porphyry allegeth this against us in these words: '*Your Evangelist* Matthew was so ignorant as to say, Which was written by the Prophet *Isaiah*, I will open my mouth in parables, &c.'" It should be observed, that Porphyry calls Matthew *Your Evangelist*;

and to this admission, or rather recognition, I attach great importance. If Porphyry could have objected to the Christians, "the Gospel which you pretend to be Matthew's, was not written by him, but was a forgery of a subsequent age," he might indeed have shaken their faith; but, instead of this, he allows that Matthew, an Apostle, an eye-witness of the transactions which he describes, really did write the Gospel which bears his name, and objects only to his ignorance in misquoting the Old Testament. Can we desire a stronger proof of the genuineness of St. Matthew's Gospel than this?

Another and similar objection is made to a quotation (in Mark, ch. i. v. 2) attributed in his MS. to Isaiah, but which is really found, the first part in Malachi, the other in Isaiah. For since this quotation is composed out of Malachi (ch. iii. v. 1) and Isaiah (ch. xl. v. 3), he asks, how it comes to pass, that it is all said to be taken from Isaiah? "To which question," says Jerom, "eccle-

siastical writers have answered largely ; but I am of opinion that the name of Isaiah has been added through the fault of the transcribers of the Gospels." These objections mark the great care and attention with which Porphyry had read the Gospels.

Having enumerated these instances of false *quotation* advanced by Porphyry against the Evangelists, we may remark the improbability that he would have been guilty himself of the fault which he ascribes to St. Matthew and St. Mark, and quote from their writings, unless he had believed them the authors.

Again, Porphyry objects to the repetition of a generation in St. Matthew's genealogy (ch. i. v. 11, 12). Here, as it seems, one and the same person, Jechonias, ends the second fourteen, and begins the third class of fourteen ; consequently, one generation was supposed to be wanting. Porphyry, therefore, as we learn from Jerom, charged St. Matthew with a mistake. This clearly proves that the genealogy in St. Matthew was received by

Christians in the time of Porphyry. With regard to the objection, it is certain that there are but thirteen generations in the second and third series*, and that the Fathers in very early times found a difficulty in this passage. It will not be improper to observe (though not immediately connected with my argument) that it has been ingeniously collected by Michaelis, from the expression, “Jesus who is called Christ†,” which is not a probable one for the Evangelist to have used—that Matthew took his genealogy from some public document or record.

Having thus far examined his objections to St. Matthew and St. Mark, I will now state his objection to a passage in John (ch. vii. v. 8). Here he animadverts on Christ’s change of intention about going up to the Feast of Tabernacles. “I go not up to the

* See Hale’s Chronology.

† Ἰησοῦς, ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός.

Feast," *ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω*, not *ἐπεὶ ἀναβαίνω*, "I go not up yet to the Feast," as it has been altered by transcribers, with a view of evading Porphyry's objection. (The reading *ἐκ ἀναβαίνω*, is retained only in the Codex Cyprius and Cantabrigiensis.) Jerom, who has recorded this objection, replies to it, as do the other Fathers, not by founding their answer on his citing the passage wrongly, but on the intimation our Lord gave of his intending shortly to go up to the feast, in that expression, "My time is not yet fully come*." Lardner† observes, that supposing Porphyry's to be the true reading, there is no reason for the charge of inconstancy, or of our Lord's altering his intention. The context shows that he spoke of deferring his journey to Jerusalem for a short time; and does not imply any resolution of not going at all to the feast. He went to the feast,

* See Dodd's Notes on this verse.

† Vol. viii. page 211.

and he always intended so to do; but he went not up to that feast so soon, nor so publicly, as he did at some other seasons; and he assigns the reason of that conduct, which may be seen verse 6 and 7. It is a glorious testimony to the unblemished integrity of our Lord's character, that so cunning and so inveterate an enemy as Porphyry was forced to have recourse to such mean and ridiculous methods of aspersing it*.

Another of his objections is to the judgment denounced by St. Peter upon Ananias and Sapphira (Acts, ch. v.). He accuses St. Peter of cruelty for inflicting this punishment; and calls it an imprecation of death. But Jerom answers well, the Apostle did by no means pray for their deaths; but by the prophetic spirit denounced the judgment of God upon them, that the punishment of two persons might be for the instruction of many.

* Dodd's Commentary.

I will merely enumerate some other passages to which he objects—to St. Matthew's call (Matthew, ch. ix. v. 9):—to the expression in St. Matthew (ch. xxiv. v. 15), "The abomination of desolation:"—to the application of the term, "Word," in the beginning of St. John's Gospel:—to St. Paul's saying he conferred not with flesh and blood (Gal. ch. i. v. 16):—to St. Paul's reproving St. Peter (Gal. ch. ii. v. 12).—In short, nothing seems wanting to complete our conviction that Porphyry believed the genuineness of the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. No one has so well described Porphyry's character and situation, or has placed in so strong a point of view the arguments in favour of the genuineness of the New Testament, arising from that consideration, as Michaelis*. This writer observes, that "the testimony of Porphyry is

* See Marsh's Michaelis, vol. i. page 41.

“ more important than that of Celsus. He
 “ lived, indeed, an hundred years later than
 “ the last-mentioned evidence; but this de-
 “ ficiency in point of time, is abundantly
 “ supplied by his profound learning, and
 “ severely critical examination of the sacred
 “ writings. He was versed not only in
 “ political, but philosophical history, as ap-
 “ pears from his Lives of the Philosophers;
 “ and we are indebted to him for some of
 “ the best historical accounts for explaining
 “ the prophecies of Daniel, as may be ga-
 “ thered from the extracts which are pre-
 “ served in the commentary of Jerom upon
 “ that subject. The explanations of Por-
 “ phyry are for the most part superior to
 “ those of the learned Father; his accurate
 “ and extensive knowledge of history en-
 “ abled him to apply those passages to An-
 “ tiochus Epiphanes, where Jerom could
 “ discover nothing but an account of Anti-
 “ christ; and if the twelfth book of the
 “ writings of Porphyry were now remaining,

“ we should probably find it to be the best
 “ commentary on the Book of Daniel. His
 “ acquaintance with the Christians was not
 “ confined to a single country, but he had
 “ conversed with them in Tyre, in Sicily,
 “ and in Rome: his residence in Basan
 “ afforded him the best opportunity of a
 “ strict intercōurse with the Nazarenes, who
 “ adopted only the Hebrew Gospel of St.
 “ Matthew; and his thirst for philosophical
 “ inquiry, must have induced him to examine
 “ the cause of their rejecting the other writ-
 “ ings of the New Testament; whether it
 “ was that they considered them as spurious,
 “ or that, like the Ebionites, they regarded
 “ them as a genuine work of the Apostles,
 “ though not divinely inspired. Enabled by
 “ his birth to study the Syriac, as well as
 “ Greek authors, he was of all the ad-
 “ versaries to the Christian religion the best
 “ qualified for inquiring into the authenticity
 “ of the Sacred Writings. He possessed,
 “ therefore, every advantage which natural

“abilities or political situation could afford,
 “to discover whether the New Testament
 “was a genuine work of the Apostles and
 “Evangelists, or whether it was imposed
 “upon the world after the decease of its pre-
 “tended authors. But no trace of this sus-
 “picion is any where to be found, nor did it
 “ever occur to Porphyry to suppose that it
 “was spurious. The prophecy of Daniel he
 “made no scruple to pronounce a forgery,
 “and written after the time of Antiochus
 “Epiphanes : his critical penetration enabled
 “him to discover the perfect coincidence
 “between the predictions and the events,
 “and, denying Divine inspiration, he found
 “no other means of solving the problem.—
 “In support of this hypothesis he uses an
 “argument, which is an equal proof of his
 “learning and sagacity, though his objec-
 “tion does not affect the authority of the
 “prophet; viz. from a Greek paronomasia
 “which he discovered in the history of
 “Daniel and Susanna, he concludes the

“book to have been written originally in
 “Greek, and afterwards translated into He-
 “brew*. Is it then credible that so sa-
 “gacious an inquirer could have failed to
 “have discovered a forgery, with respect to
 “the New Testament, had a forgery existed:
 “a discovery which would have given him
 “the completest triumph, by striking at
 “once a mortal blow on the religion which
 “he attempted to destroy?”

It may excite surprise that such a man as Porphyry should not have perceived the glory and grandeur of the Christian dispensation. But if we scrutinize his character

* Upon this passage Dr. Marsh makes the following remark (in a Note): “The objection of Porphyry affects not the authority of Daniel, because it relates to a part which is acknowledged to be spurious, or at least never to have existed in the Hebrew, and is for that reason separated from the prophecy of Daniel in the modern editions of the Septuagint, and referred to the Apocrypha, though in the earliest editions, that of Complutum for instance, as well as in all the MSS. of the Greek Bible, the story of Susanna, with that of Bel and the Dragon, make a part of the Book of Daniel.”

accurately, we shall find that, however wide the extent, or however great the variety of his learning, his judgment was far inferior to his erudition.

Nay, we are almost warranted in suspecting that he acted sometimes against conviction. It is very doubtful whether he could repel this charge. He was an advocate for demon-worship, yet he acknowledges the superior power of Christ. "How little," says Eusebius, "the power and influence of these evil spirits has prevailed, ever since our Saviour made his transitory abode among men, may be known from the treatise of that great advocate for demon-worship, Porphyry, which he wrote against us Christians; where he speaks in the following manner:—'And now they wonder that a sickness has prevailed in this city so many years, when Esculapius, and so many other gods, no longer reside here. For since Jesus has been revered within these precincts, we have never experienced

“any the least assistance from the other
“deities*.”

Whatever opinion we form of Porphyry's sincerity, there can be little doubt but that he did infinite injury to the Christians of that age by his writings; that he staggered the faith of some, and totally changed the polarity of it in others; to us, however, he affords the strongest evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament.

* Περὶ δὲ τῆ μηκεῖ, δυνασθαι τι καὶ ἰσχύειν τῆς φαυλὲς δαιμονίας, μετὰ τὴν τῆ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν εἰς ἀνδρῶν παροδόν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ καδ' ἡμᾶς τῶν δαιμονίων προσηγορὸς, ἐν τῇ καδ' ἡμῶν συσκευῇ τῆτον πεμαρτυρεῖ τὸν τρόπον. Νυνὶ δὲ θαυμάζουσιν, εἰ τοσούτων ἐτῶν κατεῖληφε τὴν πολλὴν νόσος, Ἀσκληπιῶν μὲν ἐπιδημίας καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν θεῶν μηκεῖ ὕψης. Ἰησοῦ γὰρ τιμωμένῃ, ὑδεμὶας τίς θεῶν δημοσίας ὠφελείας ποδῆτο. Eusebii Præp. Evang. p. 181. Colon. 1688.

Of the TESTIMONY of JULIAN.

FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS JULIAN was born at Constantinople in the year 331. He renounced the religion of Christ, in which he was educated, and embraced heathenism in the twentieth year of his age. In his letter to the Alexandrians, he says, "You will not wander from the right path if you will be guided by him, who to the twentieth year of his age pursued that road (meaning the Christian religion), but has now worshipped the gods for near twelve years*." This apostacy, however, was not at first made public; he still pretended to follow the Christian rite, though privately with his friends he practised augury and divination.

* Οὐχ ἀμαρτήσας διὰ πάρα ὁδοῦ οὐδὲ πειθόμενος τῇ πορευδυντὶ κακίῳ τῇ ὁδῷ ἀχρὶς ἵτων ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ ταύτην ἰδὼν συνθεὶς πορευόμενον δωδμήκατον ἔτος. Ep. LI. p. 434, ed. Spanheim, Lips. 1696.

Upon his being declared Emperor (A. D. 355), all this reserve was laid aside; he became the bitter and avowed enemy of Christianity. The heathen temples were opened by his edicts; altars were erected, and whole hecatombs sacrificed to the gods. On the 26th day of June, A. D. 363, he received a wound in an action with the Persians, and died the succeeding night, aged thirty-two. Julian has left proofs of his genius, learning, and eloquence; he is said to have been chaste and temperate, and was eminently distinguished by his courage and success in war. But superstitious to an excess, and enslaved by the rites of Paganism, Julian, though adorned with every external accomplishment, was both a hypocrite and a persecutor. About one year before his death Julian composed his books against the Christian religion. They were an abstract of what unbelievers opposed to Christianity, and especially of the objections of Celsus,

Hierocles, and Porphyry. Though the work itself is lost, yet in the answer * of St. Cyril of Alexandria, such large fragments of Julian's work are preserved, and so many passages from it quoted and transcribed at length, that every information which can be desired concerning the object and nature of the work is afforded. Julian's performance was the expiring refuge of Paganism; it was intended to be a laboured confutation of Judaism and Christianity. The work was weak, but the elegance of the style, and the exalted rank of the author, gave it a great reputation. Julian frequently quotes the writers of the New Testament by name. His attestation is of far greater importance than has been generally imagined; for though he lived one hundred years later than Porphyry, and was inferior to him in his critical inquiries, yet he was well acquainted with his

* Cyril's answer consists of ten books, dedicated to Theodosius the younger. It was written A. D. 432.

writings, as well as with those of Celsus. We may, therefore, be assured that if Celsus or Porphyry had ever in their works made any objection to the genuineness of the writings of the New Testament, this would have been insisted upon by Julian. Julian would not have acknowledged the genuineness of these writings if Celsus and Porphyry, his predecessors, had denied it. Julian's object was the extirpation of Christianity—would he have omitted any thing to render it suspected? But Christianity is founded on a rock—it has withstood the arts of ancient and modern Porphyrys. It will defy the power of any modern Julian. It has derived vigour from persecution*, as its evidences have

* The ten severe persecutions which Christianity underwent in rapid succession, lead us to the conclusion that the doctrine was true, and that it was supported by the power of the Most High. Upon this subject Bryant, in his "Truth of the Christian Religion," makes the following just remarks:—"It may, I know, be said, that every sect and schism increases by persecution. But it is an

gained additional strength by every fresh attack.

The first passage I shall quote fixes the time of our Saviour's birth. "Jesus," says Julian *, "whom you celebrate, was one of

"egregious mistake. Undue oppression and severity
 "may sometimes inflame people's minds, and control
 "beget opposition. But when persecution extends to
 "acts of universal cruelty and massacre, human nature
 "cannot stand it. Christianity was introduced into Ja-
 "pan: and the converts are by some writers said to have
 "amounted to many myriads. The last remains, after
 "they had seen the far greater part without mercy cut off,
 "took shelter in the city Samabrava. But the Japanese,
 "assisted with cannon by the Dutch, took the place, and
 "put them all to the sword. Ask now what is become of
 "Christianity in Japan? It is totally extinct. And by
 "what means? By persecution."—P. 57.

* Ο παρ υμιν κηρυττομενος Ιησους εις ην των Καισαρος υπηκουων· ει
 δε απισυτε, μικρον υστερον αποδειξω· μαλλον δε ηδη λεγισθω. Φατε
 μιντοι αυτοι απογραφασθαι μετα τη πατρος και της μητρος επι
 Κυρηνη. αλλα γινομενος των αγαθων αιτιος κατιση τοις ιαυλι συ-
 γινοισιν; η γαρ ηδηληται φησιν υπακουσαι αυτω. τι δε, ο σκληροκαρδιος
 και λιδοτραχηλος εκεινος λαος πως υπηκυσε τη Μωσει; Ιησους δε,
 ο τοις πνιμασιν επιτατιν, και βαδιζων επι της θαλασσης, και τα
 δαιμονα εξελανων, ως δε υμεις θελιτε, τοι υρατοι και την γην
 απεργασαμειος. η γαρ δε ταυτα τιτολημκει τις εκειν πωρ αυτω των
 μαθητων, ει μη μοτος Ιωαννης, υδε αυτος σαφως, υδε τρανως· αλλ

“Cæsar’s subjects. If you dispute it, I will
 “prove it by and by: but it may be as
 “well done now. For yourselves allow that
 “he was enrolled with his father and mother
 “in the time of Cyrenius. But after he was
 “born, what good did he do to his relations?
 “For *they would not*, as it is said, *believe on*
 “*him*. And yet that stiff-necked and hard-
 “hearted people believed Moses. But Jesus,
 “*who rebuked the winds, and walked on the*
 “*seas, and cast out dæmons*, and, as you will
 “have it, made the heaven and the earth
 “(though none of his disciples presume to
 “say this of him, except John only, nor he
 “clearly and distinctly; however, let it be
 “allowed that he said so), could not order
 “his designs so as to save his friends and
 “relations.” From this quotation I draw
 the following conclusions:—Jesus Christ was

εισηκεναι γε συγκαχωρησθω εκ ηδυνατο τας προαιρεσεις επι σωτηρια
 των εαυτης φιλων και συγγενων μετασθαι. Cyril. cont. Julian.
 p. 213.

not an imaginary, but a real person *, who was born in the reign of Augustus, at the time of the taxing made in Judea by Cyrenius. This Julian says he can prove. St. Luke's account of our Saviour's nativity is confirmed. The historians of the life of Christ with justice ascribed to him works of astonishing power. St. John described the transcendent dignity of the person of Christ more clearly than any other disciple, and attributed to him the creation of the world.

30 In the next quotation the four Evangelists are all mentioned by name, and also Peter and Paul.

† But you are so unhappy as not to

* It appears almost incredible, but it is a fact, that there are persons to be found who doubt, or affect to doubt, whether such a person as Jesus Christ ever existed. To the testimony therefore of Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, I add that of Tacitus, who asserts, that Christians received their name from Christus, who in the reign of Tiberius suffered death under his procurator, Pontius Pilate. Ann. l. xv. c. 44.

† Οὐὼ δὲ ἐστὶ δυστυχίης, ὥστε ὑδὲ τὰς ὑπο τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν παραδιδόμενοις ἐκμεμνηχάτε, καὶ τὰντα δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον καὶ δυσσιβήτερον, ὑπο τῶν ἐπιγινόμενων ἐξηγάσθη, τὸν γὰρ Ἰησοῦν ὅτι

“ adhere to the things delivered to you by the
 “ Apostles; but they have been altered by you
 “ for the worse, and carried on to yet greater
 “ impiety. For neither Paul, nor Matthew,
 “ nor Luke, nor Mark, have dared to call Je-
 “ sus God. But honest John, understanding
 “ that a great multitude of men in the cities
 “ of Greece and Italy were seized with this
 “ distemper, and hearing likewise, as I sup-
 “ pose, that the tombs of Peter and Paul were
 “ respected and frequented, though as yet
 “ privately only, however, having heard of
 “ it, he then first presumed to advance that
 “ doctrine.” Upon this passage I shall make
 the following remarks. Julian plainly acknow-
 ledges the genuineness and authenticity of
 the four Gospels, of Matthew, Mark, Luke,
 and John, and of the writings of Paul; and

Παυλος ετολμησεν ειπειν Θεον, εἴτε Ματθαῖος, εἴτε Λουκας, εἴτε Μαρκος·
 ἀλλ' ο χρεστος Ιωαννης, αισθομενος ηδη πολυ πληθος εαλωκος εν
 πολλαις των Ελληνιδων και Ιταλιωιδων πολεων υπο ταυτης της νοση·
 ακων δι, οιμαι, και τα μνηματια Πιτρικ και Παυλη, λαθρα μιν,
 ακων δι, ομως ανια διραπινομενα· πρωτος ετολμησεν ειπειν. Cyr.
 cont. Jul. p. 327.

that these books contain the doctrine of Christ's Apostles, the persons who accompanied him, and were witnesses of his works. The antiquity of these three first Gospels is established: St. John's Gospel was written much later than the other three, not till some time after the death of Peter and Paul. This is a very interesting testimony. The next quotation fully confirms the genuineness of the Acts of the Apostles, and establishes the truth of the history contained therein. After certain accusations, Julian says to the Christians, " * But these are your own inventions; " for Jesus has no where directed you to do " such things, nor yet Paul; the reason is, " that they never expected you would arrive " at such power: they were contented with

* Αλλά ταῦτα ὑμεῖς μαλλον ἔσιν· ἔδοκε γὰρ ὅτι Ἰησὺς αὐτὰ παρῴκε κελεύων ὑμῖν, ὅτι Παῦλος· αἰεὶ δὲ, ὅτι μὴδε ἠλπίσαν εἰς τὸ αὖτις ἀφίξειν ποτε δυνάμεις ἡμᾶς ἡγαγὼν γὰρ εἰ θρασυπαγὰς ἱεραπαίησθαι καὶ δούλους, καὶ διατείνων τὰς γυναῖκας, ἀνδράς τε, οἷος Κορνηλίος καὶ Σεργίος· ὡς εἰς ἐὰν φαῖν τῶν τῆνικαὺς γυναιζόμενων ἐπιμνησθῆις, ἐπὶ Τιβεριῶν γὰρ ἦλοι Κλαυδίου ταῦτα ἐγινῆτο, ὥστε πάντες οἱ ψευδομαί νομίζεσι. Cyril. cont. Jul. p. 206.

“deceiving maid-servants and slaves, and by
 “them some men and women; such as Cor-
 “nelius and Sergius. If there were then any
 “men of eminence brought over to you, I
 “mean in the times of Tiberius and Claudius,
 “when these things happened, let me pass for
 “a liar in every thing I say.” From this quo-
 tation we may conclude, that Christianity was
 first preached in the reigns of the Emperors
 Tiberius and Claudius; that Cornelius, a Ro-
 man centurion at Cæsarea, and Sergius Paulus
 Proconsul at Cyprus, were converted to the
 faith of Jesus before the end of the reign of
 Claudius (Acts, x. and xiii.); and that the Acts
 of the Apostles is a genuine and a true history.
 Dr. Lardner (vol. viii. p. 404) states this ar-
 gument very forcibly. Julian challenges the
 Christians to produce the names of any eminent
 men (except Cornelius and Sergius Paulus) con-
 verted (from the Gentiles) to Christianity in
 the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius. This is
 a proof that Julian did not and could not con-
 test the truth of the history in the Acts of the

Apostles; and likewise that he was well satisfied, that the Christians had no other history of the transactions of that time. He knew they relied upon the narrative given in that book, and that they did not pretend to have *any other authentic* accounts of the events there described.

Having thus seen Julian's attestation to the authenticity of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, it only remains to examine his evidence for the genuineness of the Epistles of St. Paul. He quotes St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and to the Corinthians, and evidently alludes to his Epistle to the Galatians. “* But omitting many other things,” says Julian, “by which I might show the law of Moses to be perpetual, do you show me some place where that is said, which is affirmed by Paul with so much as-

* Πολλων ἐν τοιούτων παραχέλιμμινων, ἀφ' ὧν τον νομον τῆ Μωσίου. αἰνιον ἐγὼ μιν ἵπτιν δια πληθος παρητησαμην, υμεις δε επιδιξατε πως κρηται το παρὰ τῷ Παυλῳ μίλα τὸ το λημθῆν οἱ δὲ ἴλος νομῶ Χριστος. Cyril. p. 320.

“ surance, *that Christ is the end of the law.*”
(Rom. x. 4.)

“ * But now I must again return to them. Why then are you not circumcised ?” To which they answer : “ Paul says, it is *the circumcision of the heart*, which was required, not *that of the flesh.*” (Rom. xi. 28, 29.)

Again, “ † We cannot say they keep the feast of unleavened bread, of the passover, *because Christ has been once sacrificed for us.*” (1 Cor. v. 7.)

Julian, speaking of those persons who at the beginning received the word from Paul, says, “ ‡ These are the things which he (Paul) writes of his disciples and to themselves : ‘ *Be not deceived ; neither idolaters, nor adulterers,*

* Νυνι δε επαναληπλειον ει μοι προς αυτες· δια τι γαρ εχι περιεμνεσθε ; Παυλος, φησιν, ειπε περιτομνη καρδιας, αλλ’ εχι την σαρκος δεδοσθαι. P. 351.

† Τηρην αζυμα, και ποιειν το πασχα ε δυναμιδα, φασιν· υπερ ημων γαρ απαξ ετυδη Χριστος. P. 354.

‡ Α δε γραφει περι των ακροασαμενων αυτε Παυλος προς αυτες εκεινης, εστι ταυτα· μη πλανασθε· ετε ειδωλολατραι, ετε μοχοι, ετε μαλακοι. κ. λ. P. 245.

'*nor effeminate, &c.*'" quoting with only one variation the entire 9th, 10th, and 11th verses of 1 Cor. vii.

It is certain therefore that Julian acknowledged the genuineness of St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians and to the Romans, and the genuineness of the other Epistles would hardly be denied by him who admitted these to be written by St. Paul. Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, p. 14, has observed, "that whatever ascertains the original of one Epistle, in some measure establishes the authority of the rest. For, whether these Epistles be genuine or spurious, every thing about them indicates that they come from the same hand. The diction, which it is extremely difficult to imitate, preserves its resemblance and peculiarity throughout all the Epistles." This will apply to Celsus and Porphyry. I must once more request the reader to remember that Julian was in possession of the works both of Celsus and Porphyry: he had studied them with atten-

tion. From him therefore their objections are refuted. Whatever was wanting to complete their evidence, is supplied by Julian; and I do not hesitate to affirm, that the whole body of evidence afforded by Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, amounts to a demonstrative proof of the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament.

TESTIMONIES *of the FATHERS.*

In Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp, contemporaries with the Apostles, we find quotations from St. Paul's Epistles, and allusions to evangelical writings which *then* existed.

A. D. 116.—Papias, whose testimony is preserved by Eusebius, expressly ascribes the respective Gospels to Matthew and Mark.

A. D. 140.—Justin Martyr, though he does not name the authors, has several quotations from the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles: he calls the books to which he refers “Memoirs composed by the Apostles and their companions.” From his writings a life of Christ might be compiled.

A. D. 170.—Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in some fragments of his works preserved by Eusebius, speaks of those who have attempted to corrupt the *Scriptures of the Lord*.

A. D. 172.—Tatian, in his “Oration against the Gentiles,” has allusions to the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, and is said to have written an harmony of the four Gospels.

A. D. 178.—Irenæus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul, a disciple of Polycarp (who was a disciple of St. John), gives the most full, express, and abundant testimony to the four Gospels, to the Acts of the Apostles, and to twelve of St. Paul’s Epistles.

A. D. 194.—Clement of Alexandria, the most voluminous of Christian writers, repeatedly quotes the four Gospels by the names of their authors, and expressly ascribes the Acts of the Apostles to St. Luke.

A. D. 200.—Tertullian declares, in the most decided manner, that the four Gospels were in the hands of the churches *from the first*.

It will be useful to remark, at how early a period we have the most unexceptionable evidence of writers who lived in such remote countries. This remark has often been made; but it is an obvious and important advantage to the cause, that such testimony should be afforded. Of the apostolical fathers named, Clement flourished at Rome, Ignatius at Antioch, Polycarp at Smyrna. Should even the writings of the apostolical fathers be rejected as spurious*, we have undoubtedly Justin Martyr at Neapolis in Samaria, Irenæus in France,

* See Note [N].

Clement at Alexandria, Tertullian at Carthage, bearing the most express and unexceptionable evidence to the genuineness and authenticity of the four Gospels.

A. D. 230.—Origen of Alexandria was the most learned and illustrious of the Fathers. We have his express declaration, “that the four Gospels alone are received without dispute by the whole church of God under heaven.” We cannot wish for a stronger assertion than this: it is the most complete and unequivocal testimony, and it proceeds from a man of great integrity and extensive learning. Dr. Mill remarks, that if we had all Origen’s works remaining, we should have before us almost the whole text of the Bible.

On the STYLE of the NEW TESTAMENT.

It is universally maintained by those who believe in the genuineness of the New Testa-

ment, that the writers of it were Jews*. Should this opinion be correct, it would be natural to expect that in the Greek compositions of native Jews some peculiarity of style and idiom would be discoverable, which would betray the origin of the writers. Moreover, since, according to the received opinion, the authors of the New Testament were men who had from their earliest years lived in Judea and Galilee, it should seem not only probable, but inevitable, that some idioms of their native language should adhere to them. Accordingly, we do find a very peculiar idiom prevailing in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists. The language of the New Testament is Hebraistic Greek. We find in the New Testament Hebrew † and

* St. Luke is supposed by some to have been by birth a heathen.

† *Αμην*, "truly, so be it;" *Αλληλεια*, "praise the Lord;" are Hebrew words. We may note the various use of the word *σαρξ*, the peculiar signification of *ρημα*, &c.

The writers of the New Testament supply the place of several particles with the single conjunction *και*, which

Syriac words, and Greek words used in a Hebrew or Syriac sense. The reader will remember that Syriac was the language of Galilee. There are also found Hebrew and Syriac constructions, as well as Hebrew and Syriac idioms and phrases.

We are entitled therefore to conclude, that the writings of the New Testament are exactly what might be expected from such men as we believe the Evangelists and Apostles to have been. "They are such," says Campbell*, "as, in respect of style, could not have been written but by Jews, and hardly even by Jews, superior in rank and education to those whose names they bear." This con-

they repeat as often as the Hebrew writers their Vau præfixum. Macknight observes, that the Greek particles and prepositions are used not only in all the variety of their own significations, but in the variety also of the significations of the corresponding Hebrew particles and prepositions. We have an instance of a Syriac construction in the passage, *οις ομολογησιν ιμοι*. Matt. x. 32.

* Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations, p. 21.

clusion then is of great importance, that no argument against the authenticity of the New Testament can be brought from the nature of the style; but that, after the severest scrutiny which these writings have undergone from friends and enemies, some erroneously considering this happy peculiarity as a flaw, and militating against their inspiration; others, with more zeal than judgment, describing it as a beauty; they should, by the concessions of all, be pronounced such writings as native Jews of that rank of life would have composed. But the argument from the nature of the style goes much farther, and presents an irresistible, an intrinsic evidence of their authenticity: it fixes every thing but the names of the authors. For it is a style which it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for any writer to imitate; and the first century alone produced persons to whom it was the natural style.

That peculiarity of idiom which occurs accidentally and without design, resulting from

natural simplicity, from a person writing in a foreign language, and mingling with it occasionally the idiom of his own, it would be most difficult to imitate. But how is the difficulty of imitation increased, when we consider, that, though the idiom of each Evangelist is the same, their styles are essentially different! “A discerning reader,” says Campbell*, “would not readily confound the style of Luke “with that of either of the Evangelists who “preceded him, Matthew or Mark; and still “less, I imagine, would he mistake the “Apostle John’s diction for that of any other “penman of the New Testament.” On the peculiarity of the style of St. Paul, Michaelis† makes these forcible and striking remarks: “The writings of St. John and St. Paul discover marks of an original genius, that no “imitation can ever attain, which always betrays itself by the very labour exerted to

* P. 33.

† Marsh’s Michaelis, vol. i. p. 48.

“ cover the deception ; and if we consider
 “ attentively the various qualities that compose
 “ the extraordinary character of the latter
 “ Apostle, we shall find it to be such, as no art
 “ could ever imitate. His mind overflows with
 “ sentiment, yet he never loses sight of his
 “ principal object, but hurried on, by the rapi-
 “ dity of thought, discloses frequently in the
 “ middle a conclusion to be made only at the
 “ end. To a profound knowledge of the Old
 “ Testament he joins the acuteness of philoso-
 “ phical wisdom, which he displays in applying
 “ and expounding the sacred writings ; and his
 “ explanations are therefore sometimes so new
 “ and unexpected, that superficial observers
 “ might be tempted to suppose them erroneous.
 “ The fire of his genius, and his inattention to
 “ style, occasion frequently a two-fold obscu-
 “ rity, he being often too concise to be under-
 “ stood, except by those to whom he immedi-
 “ ately wrote, and not seldom on the other
 “ hand, so full of his subject, as to produce long
 “ and difficult parentheses, and a repetition

“ of the same word, even in different senses.
 “ With a talent for irony and satire, he unites
 “ the most refined sensibility, and tempers the
 “ severity of his censures by expressions of
 “ tenderness and affection; nor does he ever
 “ forget, in the vehemence of his zeal, the rules
 “ of modesty and decorum. He is a writer, in
 “ short, of so singular and wonderful a compo-
 “ sition, that it would be difficult to find a rival.
 “ That truly sensible and sagacious philosopher
 “ Locke was of the same opinion, and con-
 “ tended that St. Paul was without an equal.” It
 will be important to remark, that the language
 of the Christian Fathers differs most widely
 from that of the New Testament; that very
 few of them were acquainted with the Hebrew;
 and that from their tenets *alone* we may fairly
 conclude, that they never could have been
 the authors of the New Testament. I shall
 conclude this subject with the following
 remarks from Campbell’s first preliminary Dis-
 sertation to his Translation of the four Gos-
 pels: “ It is pertinent, however, to observe,

“ that the above remarks on the Greek of
 “ the New Testament do not imply that
 “ there was any thing which could be called
 “ idiomatical or vulgar in the language of
 “ our Lord himself, who taught always in
 “ his mother tongue. His Apostles and
 “ Evangelists, on the contrary, who wrote
 “ in Greek, were, in writing, obliged to
 “ translate the instructions received from
 “ Him into a foreign language of a very
 “ different structure, and for the use of
 “ people accustomed to a peculiar idiom. The
 “ apparently respectful manner in which
 “ our Saviour was accosted by all ranks of
 “ his countrymen, and in which they spoke
 “ of his teaching, shows that he was univer-
 “ sally considered as a person of eminent
 “ knowledge and abilities. It was the amaz-
 “ ing success of his discourses to the people,
 “ in commanding the attention and reverence
 “ of all who heard him, which first awakened
 “ the jealousy of the Scribes and Pharisees.”

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

	A. D.
Christian churches established at Thessalonica, Corinth, Rome, Ephesus, Colosse, Philippi, &c. before the year	60
Paul sent prisoner to Rome	61
Matthew's Gospel—Paul liberated	63
Paul returns to Rome	64
First Roman persecution under Nero—Paul's last Epistle (2 Tim.)—Martyrdom of Peter and Paul	65
Luke's Gospel	66
Acts of the Apostles—Mark's Gospel	67
Vespasian invades Judæa	68
Titus destroys Jerusalem	70
Second persecution under Domitian	90
Clement	96
John's Gospel	97
Third persecution under Trajan—Tacitus—Pliny the younger	100
Ignatius	107
Polycarp	108
Papias	116
Fourth persecution under Adrian	126
Justin Martyr	140
Syriac and Latin Versions *	150
Fifth persecution under Marcus Aurelius	162
Celsus	176
Dionysius of Corinth—Tatian—Hegesippus—Melito	177
Irenæus	178
Athenagoras—Miltiades—Theophilus	181
Clement of Alexandria	194
Tertullian.	200
Sixth persecution under Severus	203
Minucius Felix.	210
Origen	230

* These versions probably existed at an earlier period.

1	...
2	...
3	...
4	...
5	...
6	...
7	...
8	...
9	...
10	...
11	...
12	...
13	...
14	...
15	...
16	...
17	...
18	...
19	...
20	...
21	...
22	...
23	...
24	...
25	...
26	...
27	...
28	...
29	...
30	...
31	...
32	...
33	...
34	...
35	...
36	...
37	...
38	...
39	...
40	...
41	...
42	...
43	...
44	...
45	...
46	...
47	...
48	...
49	...
50	...
51	...
52	...
53	...
54	...
55	...
56	...
57	...
58	...
59	...
60	...
61	...
62	...
63	...
64	...
65	...
66	...
67	...
68	...
69	...
70	...
71	...
72	...
73	...
74	...
75	...
76	...
77	...
78	...
79	...
80	...
81	...
82	...
83	...
84	...
85	...
86	...
87	...
88	...
89	...
90	...
91	...
92	...
93	...
94	...
95	...
96	...
97	...
98	...
99	...
100	...



NOTES

AND

ILLUSTRATIONS.



NOTES

NOTES

NOTES,

&c.

NOTE [A], Page 12.

EUSEBIUS, in his Ecclesiastical History, gives us the following information concerning the Scriptures universally acknowledged: "In the first place are to be ranked *the sacred four Gospels*; then the book of the Acts of the Apostles; after that are to be reckoned the Epistles of Paul. In the next place, that called the first Epistle of John, and the Epistle of Peter, are to be esteemed authentic." Lib. iii. ch. 25. These are books of undoubted authority, and universally received in the church as genuine—*ταυτα μιν εν ομολογουμενοις*. In a former chapter (lib. iii. ch. 3) Eusebius observes, "Of Paul there are fourteen Epistles manifest and well known. But yet there are some who reject that to the Hebrews, urging for their opinion, that it is contradicted by the church of the Romans as not being Paul's."—See Lardner's Credibility, vol. iv. p. 229.

NOTE [B], Page 18.

It is highly probable that a translation of the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists into the Syriac language,

was made in *very early* times. In the first century Christians were numerous in countries where this was the vulgar language, and a Syriac version was required for those who did not understand Greek. This version, with the Syriac translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, is called by the Maronites, "The pure and ancient Syriac Version." We cannot believe that any part of this version was made by one of the Apostles. Walton, however, says, "Apostolicis vero viris factam concedo, quod præter traditionem generalem ecclesiarum orientalium, cui multum in hoc tribuendum, cum nulla ratio clara in contrarium affertur, etiam ex insitis argumentis probatur in ipsâ versione quæ magnam ejus antiquitatem testantur. In antiquâ enim editione non extant Epistolæ 2 Petri; 2 & 3 Johannis, Judæ, Apocalypsis ut ex exemplari primo a Widmanstadio edito constat, & ex scriptoribus Syris, qui testantur has partes in antiquâ editione non versas fuisse, unde collegi videtur factam esse antequam Canon librorum Nov. Test. communi ecclesiarum consensu confirmatus esset, cum de his Epistolis & Apocalypsi certum sit apud antiquos dubitatum esse." Prol. 13. § 15.

I would not, however, maintain, that merely because this version wants the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Revelations, we can therefore with certainty conclude that it was made before the Canon of the New Testament was settled. This version was brought into Europe in the sixteenth century, from Ignatius, the Patriarch of Antioch,

NOTE [C], Page 18.

30 "CHARACTER Græcus Ægyptiacus, triplex dici potest; nimirum *Græcus ille communis*, quo alii omnes Græci pro-

prii variis ætatibus scripserunt; *Copticus* quo a multis jam sæculis, *Ægyptii*, ii verò maximè qui superiorem *Ægyptum* incolunt, proprio quidem sermone *Ægyptiaco*, sed *Græco* caractere scribere solent; demum *Græcus character*, quo *Ægyptii* proprii, a *Græcorum* consortio alieni, *Græcè* scribunt; sed formâ literarum diversâ et peregrinitatis notam ferente. Character *Græcus* sub *Alexandro Magno*, qui *Ægyptum* subegit, in eam regionem allatus est. Postea verò sub *Ptolemæis* regibus, *Græca* lingua *Alexandriæ* & in vicinis locis admodum floruit; fuitque jam illo ævo *Alexandria* elegantissimæ *Græcæ* scriptionis officina. Deinde item sub imperio *Romano*, scribendi librosque conficiendi arte diu palmam tulit *Alexandria*; donec in *Arabum* ditionem transiret. Tuncque a prisco illo literario splendore desitum est. Alterum scribendi genus *Ægyptiacum*, est *Coptorum*, qui linguam quidem *Ægyptiacam* retinent; sed caractere *Græco* utuntur admixtis tamen octo literis, quæ non sunt *Græcis* in usu; nam triginta duas in alphabeto suo habent, *Græci* autem viginti-quatuor. Tertius character *Ægyptiacus Græcus*, observatur in quibusdam, sed admodum paucis codicibus; ubi tum verba ipsa, tum literæ, *Græcæ* quidem sunt; sed olent peregrinum & primo conspectu sese produnt.”—*Montfaucon, Palæogr. Græca*, lib. iv. ch. vii. p. 311.

NOTE [D], Page 21.

THE *Æthiopic* version of the New Testament contains twenty-seven books, and is divided into four parts. The first part contains the four Gospels in the usual order—the second part, the Acts—the third part, the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul—the fourth part, the seven Catholic Epistles. The Apocalypse is added as an Appendix. “Pro additamento est illis Visio Johannis Abukalamsis,

quam vocem ex Græco ἀποκαλυψις corruptam, fortasses cognomentum ejus esse putaverunt.”—Lud. Hist. Æthiop. lib. iii. cap. 4. It is believed by some that the Æthiopians received the Gospel by means of the eunuch who was treasurer to Candace, Queen of Æthiopia. Acts, viii. They have a tradition that they were instructed in the knowledge of the true God by Jewish priests, whom Makedah, Queen of Sheba, brought with her from King Solomon; and to the same source they trace certain customs. “Qui traditionem Habessinorum de reginâ Maquedâ admittunt ii ferè sunt qui putant eos cognitionem veri Dei a tempore Salomonis habuisse; ritusque Judaicos veluti circumcisionem; abstinentiam a cibis lege Mosaicâ vetitis, & similia originem suam inde traxisse.”—Lud. lib. iii. cap. 1.

NOTE [E], Page 21.

THE Armenian Version of the New Testament was taken from the Syriac.

“Armeni Arabum & Phrygum sunt affines, unde faciliè conjiciendum est, linguam illorum esse mixturam ex Arabicâ, Phrygicâ & Syriacâ dialecto; ut adeo e plurium gentium linguis nova conflata sit. Characteres Armenorum planè sunt singulares, & omnium maximè quoad externam formam ad typum Russorum accedunt. Communem enim habent Russorum & Armenorum characteres originem; nimirum antiquiorem Græcorum typum, qui aliquantulum immutatus inter Armenos, & cum aliâ deviatione inter Russos obtinet locum.”—Le Long, Bib. Sacra, ed. Masch, P. II. vol. i. sect. 9.

In the earliest times the Armenians had no letters peculiar to their own language, and whenever they wrote were obliged to borrow either from the Persian, the

Syriac, or the Greek. Miesrob in the fourth century invented letters that accurately expressed the sounds of the Armenian language.—Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. ii. p. 99.

NOTE [F], Page 21.

It is highly probable that the Persians had a very ancient version of the Scriptures into their language. "*Olim habuisse Persas totam Scripturam in linguam suam versam, ex veterum scriptis abunde liquet: quod ex Theodoro & aliis supra ostendimus. Licet enim de generali totius gentis conversione nihil legimus (nullum enim regum Persarum Christianum fuisse ex historiis constat); fidem tamen Christianam multum propagatam & publice toleratam ibi fuisse; multasque ecclesias ibi fundatas, episcoposque plurimos martyrio celebres fuisse, ex Historia Ecclesiastica certum est.*"—Walton, *Proleg.* xvi. It may well be doubted whether any remains of this ancient version exist at present. All that are known to us are modern, "*An vero reliquæ aliquæ antiquæ versionis Persicæ adhuc extent, multum dubitatur. Versiones enim, quas jam habemus, Pentateuchi scil. Psalmorum & Evangeliorum recentiores esse non diffitemur.*"—Walton, *ib.* "It is much to be regretted," says Dr. Adam Clark, "that a complete version of the best of books does not exist in one of the most elegant languages. Were the whole Bible translated into Persian, there can be little doubt but it would be extensively read in the East; and perhaps find nearly as many admirers as it found readers."

NOTE [G], Page 28.

BEFORE the invention of printing, the only way of obtaining copies of books was by transcribing them; hence omissions, transpositions, and alterations would arise in

different manuscripts. The new copy would retain the errors of the one from which it was taken, with the addition of those which the transcriber should himself make. "Errores itaque omnes a scribis interpretibus ortos fuisse, necessarium est. A scribis vel librariis, qui exemplaria descripserunt, et non satis accuratè cum codice originario contulerunt, fluxere primò; a quibus alii alia describentes, errores eorum propagarunt, qui (non extantibus codicibus originariis, unde corrigi et emendari poterunt) in plures derivati sunt."—Walton, Proleg. vi. § 6.

The manuscripts, however, of the New Testament are fortunately neither of a late date nor few in number; but there are, of different ages, many more manuscripts of this *than of any other ancient writing*; and in the present age, from the great progress made in Biblical criticism, and the many advantages afforded, we may venture to pronounce that we are able to fix nearly with certainty the readings which *originally composed the Sacred Text*.

NOTE [H], Page 30.

THE following extracts from Montfaucon will afford information as to the time when accents were first introduced, and on the variation of the form of the Greek letters. "Scimus quidem septimo circiter sæculo accentus & spiritus adscribi cæpisse; deinde paulatim priscam literarum formam nonnihil mutatam fuisse; ita ut tamen literæ distinctæ & separatæ manerent, donec sæculo circiter octavo vel nono, literas in libris colligandi, multasque uno calami ductu exarandi consuetudo inveheretur, —De priscis autem illis, accentu & spiritu carentibus manuscriptis, id unum certò dici posse videtur, usque ad septimum circiter sæculum hoc modo scriptitatum fuisse.—Si qua remotioris ævi indicia in hujusmodi codicibus occurrant, ea maxime petuntur ex similitudine literarum cum

characteribus inscriptionum, quæ sub imperio Romano ad quartum usque Christi sæculum positæ sunt. Hi porro vetustissimi characteres unciales quadri simul & rotundi dici possunt. Hic vero character postquam accentus adscribi cæperunt a priscâ formâ degeneravit; ita ut literæ angustiores longioresque exararentur.”—Montfaucon, Pal. Græca, lib. iii. cap. i.

NOTE [I], Page 31.

A general Description of the Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament—from Wetstein's Prolegomena.

· CODICES partim sunt membranacei, partim chartacei. Membrana vel est purpura infecta vel sui coloris; eadēque vel tenuior vel crassior. Charta item vel est bombycina vel communis, eaque rursus vel lævigata atque ex-polita, vel notæ deterioris.

· Membranæ istæ in quaterniones distinguuntur, quorum singuli plerumque octo sunt foliorum, numeris in priore cujusque vel summâ vel imâ paginâ notatis distincti.

Paginæ singulæ in plerisque omnibus Græcis manuscriptis ad circinum et normam paribus spatiis dividuntur, ut lineæ æquali intercapedine dirimantur, parque ipsarum numerus sit in singulis paginis.

Literæ sunt vel majores vel minores, illæ tempore Hieronymi vocabantur unciales, rursus in duò genera distinguendæ. Literæ veteres primi generis figurâ sunt inornatâ ac simplici, æquabili ductu exaratæ. Literæ veteres secundi generis sunt multò pinguiorēs, inæquali ductu atque angulosæ, aliæ velut basi quâdam fultæ, aliæ variis apicibus ornatae aut oneratæ potius. Quum verò prior illa plane eadem scriptura sit, quæ in antiquioribus inonumentis Græcorum comparet; posterior picturam semibarbarorum temporum sapiat, apparet utique, priorem characterem rectè assignari seculo vi., posteriorem ix.

In libris priori scriptura exaratis, *accentus & spiritus ut et distinctiones vocum plerumque desunt.*

Orthographiæ ratio in veteribus ferè eadem est, ab hodiernâ autem nonnihil recedit.

Etiam vetustissimi quasdam voces in compendio scribunt, ita ut primam tantum atque ultimam, interdum & mediam literam, pro integrâ voce ponant lineâque superductâ tegant.

Ubi novus liber incipit, quod semper fit in summâ paginâ, priores tres vel quatuor vel quinque lineæ minio exaratæ sunt.

Libri in plurimas periodos, duos, tres aut plures versus, in quos nostri codices jam distributi sunt, comprehendentes, dividuntur. Hæ sæpe incipiunt in eâdem lineâ, ubi desiit prior periodus, unius vocabuli relicto intervallo, sequentis vero lineæ litera prima paulum in margine excurrente & reliquis majore. In aliis autem, ubi minus parci chartæ fuerunt librarii, post finitum paragraphum relinquitur vacuum spatium, & sequens paragraphus novam lineam incipit.

Omnes etiam vetustissimi codices habent *καταλα* & *πλες*; Eusebianos, a primâ manu, excepto Vaticano & Cantabrigiensi.

Faucissimi codices sunt qui totum Nov. Test. complectuntur. Major pars iv. duntaxat Evangelia continet, quorum lectio in ecclesiâ fuerat frequentior.

Ex omnibus ferè codicibus præsertim vetustioribus folia quædam, imo & quaternio unus alterve vel temporum injuriâ vel hominum culpâ perierunt.

Etiam vetustissimi codices plurimas habent correctiones. Delebant autem, quæ sublata cupiebant, vel puncto cuilibet literæ vocive delendæ superposito, vel obelo tenui illas transfigente a dextrâ ad sinistram, vel quod pessimum æquè atque frequentissimum est, scalpello.

Hinc est, quod prioribus literis erasis, substitutæ novæ apparent; ita tamen ut prior scriptura in aliis sub rasurâ adhuc legi possit, in aliis verò dispareat.

Solebant etiam librarii veterem scripturam spongiâ delere, & alia superscribere.

Aliquando integra folia in *Supplementum* deperditorum a juniore manu adscripta inseruntur. Quod notandum est, ne lector specie majoris vetustatis decipiatur.

Notandum etiam est, ubi a primâ vel ab aliâ manu, hujus vel illius festi, quo certa Evangelii aut Epistolæ *επιλογη* legenda est, fit mentio; item ubi varia nomina urbium, cænobiorum, hominumque occurrunt; hæc enim nos possunt deducere in notitiam vel temporis, quo scriptus fuit, liber, vel loci, ubi usibus publicis inservit.

NOTE [K], Page 34.

WOIDE maintains by good arguments that the Codex Alexandrinus was written in Egypt. "In Ægypto scriptum fuisse, etiam orthographia libri manifestè evincit; et creber ejus cum codicibus Ægyptiacis consensus; et canones Eusebii in ecclesiâ Alexandrinâ recepti; & canones diurni & nocturni, in monasteriis Ægypti admissi, id etiam confirmant." The same critic afterwards observes, "E pronuntiatione Ægyptiacâ vitia orthographiæ derivanda esse existimo." Wetstein calls this "Codex membranaceus in folio"—and Woide says, "Membrana est formæ majoris in folio, sed vel deperdita est magna pars marginis superioris, vel abscissa a bibliopega cum librum compingeret. Margo enim inferior plerumque duorum cum dimidio, raro trium est pollicum, cum superior sæpius nec unius pollicis, rarò unius cum dimidio esse deprehendatur.

"Literæ sunt ubique unciales, perpendiculares, elegantes, rotundæ. Nullos habet accentus aut spiritus, vel a primâ vel a secundâ manu additos. Voces quidem sine

ullo discrimine conjungit." With regard to the antiquity of this Codex, Woide concludes as follows: "Si itaque lectores et formas literarum codicis nostri, Clementis Romani Epistolas & Psalmos Salomonis, Euthalii sectiones & τρισαχίων quæ desunt, si cætera argumenta summam ejus antiquitatem confirmantia, consideratissimè perpenderit; omnia conspirare videbunt ut Codicem Alexandrinum *intra medium et finem seculi quarti scriptum esse* ipsis persuadeant."—Preface to the fac-simile of the Cod. Alexandrinus.

NOTE [L], Page 39.

Codex Claromontanus.

MONTFAUCON, in his *Palæographia Græca*, gives a fac-simile of this manuscript, of which he says, "Tenuissimis elegantissimisque membranis constat; scriptusque fuit septimo circiter sæculo, ut ex characterum tam Græcorum quàm Latinorum formâ arguitur; nam Latina versio inalterâ semper paginâ jacet. Character Græcus nullam olet peregrinitatem, sed a peritâ manu exaratus est. Scriptus autem est per κωλα et κομμάτια, ita ut ad singulas vel minimas distinctiones a lineâ resumatur. Accentus et spiritus annotantur sed ii secundâ manu ut videtur, nec diu, ut creditur, post descriptum codicem adjecti sunt."—Lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 217.

NOTE [M], Page 42.

Codex Ephrem.

"CONTINET ille codex recentiore quidem manu duodecimi circiter sæculi S. Ephræmi opera. Sed alia *antiquissima* scriptura ibidem habetur, quâ vetustate simul & arte penè oblitteratâ, alia longè recentiora superscripta sunt, S. Ephræmi videlicet opera, uti diximus. Illa vero vetustissima scriptura complectitur variorum Sacræ Scripturæ librorum, maximeque Novi Testamenti folia, sed confusa & plerumque inversa; id curante librario recentiore, ut

pristina illa, si fieri posset, de medio tolleret & obrueret. Charactere unciali sine accentibus priora illa descripta sunt. Atramentum quod uti jam dictum est, longâ temporum serie, plerumque in vetustioribus exemplaribus subrubrum evadit, hic multo vividioris coloris conspuitate fulget, quàm in cæteris vetustis libris, in quos incidimus. Ad marginem habentur variæ quædam lectiones & notæ liturgicæ de Evangeliiis per annum recitandis. Marginales item notæ unciali quidem characterе descriptæ sunt sine accentibus; sed manu ut videtur recentiore ac longè inelegantiore.”—Montfaucon, Pal. Græca, lib. iii. ch. iii. p. 213.

I do not think that I owe any apology to the reader for the length of the extracts in these Notes, from Montfaucon and Wetstein. I have been much indebted to Wetstein’s general account of manuscripts; it is the best that has ever been written, and under the persuasion that it might be interesting to many readers, I have given an outline of it in his own words. The substance of these Notes is to be found in the Text.

NOTE [N], Page 88.

THEY who doubt the genuineness of the epistle ascribed to Polycarp, entertain none whatever that such a man lived, and that he was a disciple of St. John. Irenæus expressly says, that “Polycarp was not only taught by the Apostles, and had conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also by the Apostles appointed Bishop of the church of Smyrna in Asia.” Irenæus adds, that he in his youth had *seen* Polycarp, who at a great age suffered a glorious martyrdom. It should seem no easy matter to set aside the evidence of Irenæus alone. How it *can* be set aside I am unable to imagine. Words cannot be framed which would declare the authenticity of the four Gospels more clearly than the following from the

Third Book of Irenæus, against Heresies :—" We have
 " not received," says this Father, " the knowledge of
 " the way of our salvation by any other than those by
 " whom the Gospel has been brought to us ; which
 " Gospel they first preached, and afterwards by the will
 " of God committed to writing, that it might be for time
 " to come the foundation and pillar of our faith. For
 " after that our Lord rose from the dead, and they (the
 " Apostles) were endued from above with the power of
 " the Holy Ghost coming down upon them, they received
 " a perfect knowledge of all things. They then went
 " forth to all the ends of the earth, declaring to men the
 " blessing of heavenly peace, having all of them, and
 " every one alike, the Gospel of God. Matthew then,
 " among the Jews, wrote a Gospel in their own lan-
 " guage, while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel
 " at Rome, and founding a church there. And after
 " their exit (death, or departure), Mark also, the dis-
 " ciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in
 " writing the things that had been preached by Peter :
 " and Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book
 " the Gospel preached by him (Paul). Afterwards John,
 " the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his
 " breast, he likewise published a Gospel while he dwelt at
 " Ephesus, in Asia. And all these have delivered to us,
 " that there is one God, the Maker of the heaven and
 " the earth, declared by the law and the prophets, and
 " one Christ, the Son of God." If the testimony of
 Irenæus needed any confirmation, let it be remembered
 that at this very time Celsus was attacking the four
 Gospels, under the *conviction* that they were the genuine
 works of the Apostles and Evangelists.

THE END.

Printed by S. Gosnell, Little Queen Street, London.







